

Beginning of Socialism & religion

This title was preceded by

A special study of the relationship of religious
education to the problem child

Ancient Israelitish beliefs concerning the future life


And is continued by

The renaissance of Jesus in India

Woman in the early church

Thomas Cranmer and his place in the Reformation

Search by above titles on archive.org to
continue reading this collection of Pacific
School of Religion Theses from 1931,
call number Thesis Cage 1931 v.4



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

SOCIALISM & RELIGION

BY

P'ei Yu Li

A.B. Fukien Christian University, 1923
A.M. Pacific School of Religion, 1930.

Thesis

submitted in the Department of
Social Service
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity
in
Pacific School of Religion

1931

CONTENTS

Chapter 1.

What Socialism Is

1. The Aim of Socialism

2. Bases of the Objection of Socialism to Capitalism

(1) A Competitive Economy, as we now have, is Bad

a. It is Wasteful

b. It gives birth to Economic Imperialism

c. It gives rise to Unemployment

d. It creates a class not only of Unemployed,
but of Unemployables

(2) The almost pecuniary motive of present industry gives rise to bad working conditions, emphasis upon things instead of humans, the slowness to undertake civic or industrial improvements unless there is an immediate profit in view

(3) The most destructive result of our present system is the bad distribution of the national income

(4) The present system fosters a series of unearned incomes based upon the cumulative poverty of society as a whole

3. Socialism is not Communism nor Anarchism

4. Objections to Socialism Weighed

(1) Socialism and Competition

(2) There is a prevalent opinion that unless one is given more money than another one would not work hard and longer

- (3) One objection made to socialism is that equality of income is not fair to merit
- (4) It is said that the socialist underestimates the importance of individual responsibility
- (5) It is said that the socialist underestimates the efficiency of the present system
- (6) It is said that the socialist underestimates the importance of free enterprise in industry
- (7) The most common objection to socialism is the impairment to liberty

Chapter 2

What Religion Is.

- 1. The Darwinian theories
- 2. The Democratic trend in the nineteenth century
- 3. Socialism finds itself in conflict with the Roman Catholic clergy
- 4. Hatred for organized Christianity because of its being false to the essential teachings of Jesus
- 5. A definition of Religion
- 6. In the strict sense, only Christianity is religion

Chapter 3

Can Religion and Socialism Co-exist?

- 1. The Essentials of Christian Teaching
- 2. Ideals of Socialism compatible with those of Christianity
- 3. Socialism and Religion - one the complement of the other.

SOCIALISM & RELIGION

Chapter 1

What Socialism Is

1. The aim of Socialism. Socialism is but an opinion as to how the economic system of a country should be organized. It aims at the establishment of industrial democracy through the instrumentality of the State. It advocates the theory that the "business functions of government should be expanded until the more important businesses are absorbed."¹ The socialists are not, as are supposed by the uninformed, capital-condemners; what they seek to abolish is the private capitalist. They hold that wealth - all wealth - is created by labor, and land and capital are merely passive factors of production. Only labor is the active factor and those who do not work have no right, therefore, to receive a share of the product. The socialists desire to do away with the private capitalists and to socialize capital, because they wish to make of universal application the command of the Apostle Paul, "If a man will not work, neither let him eat." Their ideal, then, is to make every person a useful member of the community by means of a change in the fundamental conditions governing the acquisition of incomes.

Socialists hold that only through the socialistic control of income equality of opportunity can come into being.

1. Richard T. Ely, *Outlines of Economics*, p. 597.

Instead of being used for selfish purposes as under the capitalistic system the income will be used to promote public welfare and to meet all needs. Every one will have the same amount of opportunity in any thing so far as the economic or financial bearing is concerned. For instance, every one will financially be able to enter college, will have as much medical care as he needs or as much time for recreation as any one else. No woman shall have diamonds while some women have not even decent clothes. It will not, as does under the present system of unequal distribution of income, happen that one fashionably dressed woman may cost the life of ten babies under the pinch of poverty. No such thing will there be as that the million losses happen in the longing for the one gain that the million unlucky ones have to pay for. No parents will make sacrifices in the hope that education will enable their sons to rise from the slough of poverty.

2. Bases of the objection of socialism to the present system of capitalism. There are many books on socialism to which one can appeal for information regarding the dissatisfactions of socialists with the existing economic order. I don't mean that in criticising the present system one should depend entirely upon books for materials: one has to resort to his own thinking and experience for the intelligent guide to sound judgment.

It is from both books and my own experience that I derive my judgment as to the attitude of socialists toward the present system. The bases on which socialists object to capitalism may be stated as follows:

(1) A competitive economy, as we now have, is bad.

a. It is wasteful. One of the glaring evils in America is her wasteful system of production. Much is produced and much is wasted. I have seen that in a time when price is low orchards and orchards of fruits are left on the fruit-trees to rot. This is seen in every fruit season wherever there are fruit orchards. Just think how much is wasted in ~~terms~~ of product, labor, time, and expense.

Another waste attending the competitive system results from duplication of services. "No practical business man would be guilty of the stupidity of putting a hundred men to do the work that could be done just as well by a single man; and yet, this is exactly the ¹stupidity of which the competitive system is guilty." We are all familiar with the amazing economy of time, labor, and expense, achieved by the world-wide organization known as the Post Office, and how, for the insignificant sum of 5 cents, a letter written in San Francisco can be delivered in Shanghai. Let us consider for a moment the cost of doing this were letters distributed throughout the native country or to foreign countries in the same

1. Edmond Kelly, Twentieth Century Socialism, p. 97.

way as our other commodities. In America, for instance, every block of houses is served with milk by a number of milk dealers instead of by one, as would be the case if the distribution of milk were in the hands of one agency; so every block is furnished with butter, eggs, meat, fish, and vegetables by a number of dealers in butter, eggs, meat, fish, and vegetables, instead of by one, and so on, through every article that enters into our daily use.

Compare with this the economy of time, labor, and expense effected by the government Post Office through sorting letters beforehand according to streets, and confining the distribution in any one street to a single carrier who distributes the letters with the greatest economy of time and labor, from door to door.

Another waste lies in the method of "getting the market." Every manufacturer has to find purchasers for his product. We little appreciate the enormous cost which attends the bringing of goods to the attention of the public. The other day I bought a package of candy from a salesman at twenty cents. He said that they were advertising that kind of candy and so put something else in every package which is worth more than the candy. Nowadays practically every business has to use one form of advertisement or another to get the market. Just think how much money is wasted in this way.

By no means small is the loss of by-products that in-

evitably results from manufacturing upon anything less than a gigantic scale. "The managers of the Standard Oil Trust testify that among the waste products capable of being utilized in sufficiently large refineries are gasoline, paraffine, lubricating oil, vaseline, naphtha, aniline dyes, and no less than two hundred drugs; and that the total value of these waste products is actually¹ as great as that of the oil itself."

Still other wastes are such as waste of capital owing to bankruptcy, waste of human energy in the work of competition, and above all waste in unemployment leading to vagrancy and pauperism. We need produce no testimony to prove things so obvious as the immortality, injustice, and cruelty of overemployment and unemployment and the necessary results thereof: drunkenness, disease, pauperism, prostitution, insanity, and crime.

Under socialism no fruit will be left on the tree to rot because of bad market and low price. All products will be put into consumption instead of being held in waiting for high price. No such thing is to be seen as that orchards and orchards of fruits are left to rot while many and many persons are longing for fruits to eat. Duplication of services in many fields will be done away with. The waste attending the effort of "getting the market" through advertising and commercial tra-

1. Testimony of Mr. Archbold (pp. 570-571) in the report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. I, 1900.

vellers will go out of sight. All by-products will be utilized as much as possible. People will not know what bankruptcy is. There will be no disease, pauperism, vice, crime and social evils, as a result of unemployment and unequal distribution of income.

b. Competitive economy gives birth to economic imperialism. No better illustration could be given of this than the war through which England compelled China to purchase Indian opium. The remunerative prices obtained by the production of opium in India had so developed this branch of business that millions of Indians depended for their lives upon it, thus bringing about a condition under which England must commit a crime against China, or millions of her subjects must perish in Hindustan.

c. The competitive system gives rise to unemployment, which in turn causes underemployment and underpayment. It is true that the efficiency of machine has thrown many persons out of employment. But this happens only under the capitalistic system; whereas in the socialistic government there will not be such a thing as what is known as the "cyclical fluctuation" which gives rise to unemployment as a mere failure of adjustment between demand and supply, - in it every one has to work for his share of living, - and every one will have to work for such a number of hours a day as deemed necessary to produce the amount of products needed to supply the daily consumption.

d. The competitive system creates a class not only of

unemployed, but of unemployables. It is only under this system of ours that a strong, hearty, able-bodied man, not only willing, but burning to work, with plenty of work to be done and with plenty of food to be eaten, is refused both. Those who are employed are forced by the factory owner through speeding up his machinery to the utmost point to do the greatest work possible during the hours of employment. The factory owner does not adopt this method out of hardness of heart, but out of the necessity of the market. If he pays a workingman high wages for short hours, he must get the greatest work out of him if he is to compete successfully with other factory owners in the same line of business. Even the most merciful factory owners have to overwork their employees in order to sell goods at prices fixed by the merciless market. This creates a class of men who cannot render efficient service because of disease and of the drunkenness to which overwork tends; for when a workingman feels his strength begin to wane he has to recourse to stimulants to last his day out, and once the habit of stimulants is contracted, he loses his appetite for nourishing food and becomes thereby more and more confirmed in the use of intoxicants.

(2) The almost pecuniary motive of present industry gives rise to bad working conditions, emphasis upon things instead of humans, the slowness to undertake civic or industrial improvements unless there is an immediate profit

in view. It tends towards financial manipulation instead of concerning itself in industry with the production of goods. The industrial technologist has been superseded by the financial genius making his fortune by the capitalisation process. Altogether, we have a shortsighted principle of looking only at the present, and very little concerning ourselves with the future.

(3) The most destructive result of our present system is the bad distribution of the national income; and this, not only between different classes, but also is between different members of the same class. It results in poverty and all Bernard Shaw attributes to it in his oft-quoted phrase - "Let him be poor."¹ (Major Barbara) It means a general lack of culture and education among the masses. It means that there is created an invidiousness for those who have not; and an emulative policy for those who have, in order to show others what they have and how much of it.

(4) The present system fosters a series of unearned incomes based upon the cumulative poverty of society as a whole. We are land-poverty-stricken - hence rent. We are ability-poverty-stricken - hence one gets a high wage and another a low wage. We are capital-poverty-stricken - hence an interest charge. Further, it fosters unearned increment from non-social production (monopolies

1. Bernard Shaw, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism.

and franchises) and from anti-social productions (dope, patent medicine, quackeries and nostrums), etc.

This is the socialist's criticism of present industrial countries. The best among recent books on socialism is, at least in my judgment, Bernard Shaw's *The Intelligent Woman's Guide To Socialism and Capitalism*. In it I find the most able, intelligible and fascinating presentation of socialism as the best form of government toward the creation of universal happiness of mankind. As Fabian opportunism is wont to do, Shaw points out the inevitability of these defects being abolished by a gradual policy of government ownership of industry (socialism). The new government formed of socialists will pay for every thing it takes over.

Shaw's favorite plan (the only tenable one, he says) is equality of income for all workers, and compulsory work for their living. Under this system no one will want more pay because he will have no use for it - everything one needs is already obtainable for the amount of money is the equal income.

Now, the crux of the whole situation seems to lie in the proposition - "Where shall we put the minimum?" And Shaw makes no pretense at discussing it. What shall be produced? And how much of it? He does not entertain these questions, and, I think, rightly so. It is, at the present stage, impossible to say where the minimum

shall be, and what direction it shall take. The only point of issue in my mind is: Shall we, under our new society, be able to produce enough to give each \$25,000? Shaw's answer is undoubtedly "Yes"; for he seems to imply that even if the present income were equally divided we could approximate that point. And if we were to abolish the competitive character of industry, employ all employable and pursue a far-sighted policy, the per capita production would be far more than \$25,000. (Better judged as per family than per capita.)

What to buy for the minimum? Who cares? One can't buy what is not produced. What to produce? Those things most of us want? All we can do is to assume amply production, and the direction of it will have to be fixed by some sort of regulatory board; that is all that we can say. We can't attempt to alter each individual's psychology, or even cater to it.

The competitive aspect, under government production, will be lost. Pecuniary motives will be abolished, per se, because one always has all his needs. Hence the disappearance of national competition, economic imperialism, but foreign trade (exchange) remains. Nor will there be developed an economic stagnation out of this non-competitive society. We shall have developed a social point of view toward work; and work, while compulsory, will not be invidious as now. "Work", to use Tawney's

phrase, "will have the same status as the professions now have - pride and a 'collective responsibility' for each group."

Under such a system no unearned increment on land, or capital or ability will exist in terms of money to its possessor (except as the government collects the rent on land, capital and other ability). One will take just pride in giving to society more than he takes out of it, if he can. He will surely have more ambition for the higher competition - e.g. skill, etc.

3. Socialism is not communism and anarchism. Communists are those who advocate the use of violence in their desire to realize their ideals. On the contrary, socialists favors the method of permeation - permeation of socialistic ideals by means of education. Socialism can be brought about only when people are prepared for it. This preparation takes time as evidenced by the slowness in the change of public opinion; it is, for instance, very hard to make people think otherwise who are educated under capitalism to regard success in life as meaning more money than anyone else and no work to do for it. Bernard Shaw says, "Only in a settled and highly civilized society with a strong Government and an elaborate code of laws can equality of income be attained or maintained. Now a strong Government is not one with overwhelming fighting forces in its pay: that is rather the mark of a panicky Government. It is one

that commands the moral approval of an overwhelming majority of the people. A morally shocking Government cannot last, and cannot carry out such changes as the change from our present system to Socialism, which are matters of long business arrangements and extensions of the Civil Service. They must be made thoughtfully, bit by bit; and they must be popular enough to establish themselves too solidly for changes of Government to shake them, like our postal system or our socialism in roads, bridges, police, drainage, and highway lighting. We should have the same trouble (as had Moses who found the Israelites so unfitted for freedom, that he had to keep them wandering round the desert for forty years, until there was achieved the change of condition, and habit, and mind, and the reluctance of those who had been safe and well treated as slaves to face danger and hardship as free adventurers.), if we attempted to impose socialism all in a lump on people not brought up to it. They would wreck it because they could not understand it nor work its institutions; and some of them would just hate it." ¹ I am in hearty accord with Shaw, because in the eyes of my experience it seems to me that a rash and violent method is liable to create confusion and disorder, and a peaceful and educational method almost always brings forth better result. Just as public health cannot be attained or maintained without popular understanding

1. Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Women's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, pp. 391-2.

of what it is, so can't socialism be brought about without corresponding understanding. Communists, who advocate the use of violence, are, therefore, like a man who is blind to the fact that a horse can be brought to the water but cannot be made to drink.

Another different feature between Socialism and Communism is pointed out by Richard T. Ely, who says, "Communism now very generally signifies the abolition of private property not only in production goods, but in consumption goods as well, whereas most socialists contemplates the retention of private property in personal income."

¹ Edmund Kelly says, "The early Christians were communists; so were Plato and Sir Thomas More.

The laboring class is entitled to the full product of its labor; that is to say, it shall securely have exactly what it earns; no more, no less; it shall be deprived of it neither by the capitalist as to-day nor by the thriftless or vicious as under the Communism of Apostolic times."

² Socialism then does not stand to-day for Communism. On the contrary, it demands that the workers be assured, as exactly as is humanly possible, the product of their labor, and not share it with the idle and vicious on the one hand or be deprived of it by the capitalist on the other.

Still another different feature is that communists

1. R. T. Ely, Outlines of Economics, p. 603.

2. E. Kelly, Twentieth Century Socialism, pp. 33-34.

desire to take every thing over all at once from the landlords and the capitalists, regardless of being ready or not to use it productively; whereas socialists do not regard merely-takingover as socialistic. The latter's idea may be made clearer by quoting Shaw's statement, "You must take only when you have some immediate use for it, and are ready to start on the job next morning."

Nothing is more indicative of one's ignorance than the confusion which one has in his mind between Anarchism and Socialism. One thing Socialism and Anarchism do have in common, and that is, discontent with existing conditions. The remedies, however, propounded by the Anarchists for evil conditions and those propounded by the Socialists are contradictorily opposite. In contrast with the socialist, the anarchist holds that the ideal arrangement is that men should freely and spontaneously form cooperative groups. The anarchists attack government and deny the right of one man to exercise authority over another, or of a majority to have power over a minority. Freedom, independence, self-reliance, non-compulsion, are what appeal to them. This ideal may be said to have taken its start at the period of the French Revolution, and is generally connected with Adam Smith, the Manchester School of laissez faire, the earlier works of John Stuart Mill, and all the works of Herbert Spencer. Such an ideal contains nothing reprehensible, but its complete attainment is impossible. When the pernicious consequences

of allowing every individual to do as he chose with his own pleasure became felt, as for example in the poisoning of rivers by allowing every factory to pour its waste into them; and in degeneration of the race through unlimited exploitation of women and children in factories and mines, governments all over the world have been obliged as measures of self-defence to enact laws limiting individual action. Every one understands that it is evils resulting from the abuse of property under capitalism that have made socialists advocate the functions of government to be extended sufficiently to secure to every man the greatest amount of liberty.

It is clear then that there is a whole world between the socialists and the anarchists in their views. Kelly is right when he says, "Indeed it is impossible to conceive two theories of government more opposite one to another than that of Socialism, which demands more government, and that of anarchism, which demands the destruction of government altogether."¹

4. Objections to Socialism Weighed.

In order to make a theory which one advocates more convincing and positive, one has to do one thing, that is, one should take the opinions of others into consideration, weigh them with intelligence as well as experience, and make from them deductions which are sound enough to in-

1. Edmund Kelly, Twentieth Century Socialism, p. 33.

validate their opposing force toward the theory. This is the very position I take in dealing with objections which have so far been made to socialism. They are to be judged one by one as follows:

(1). Socialism and Competition. Nothing is more common than to hear that socialism checks progress by suppressing competition. This is but an exaggeration, for no modern socialist maintains that all competition is bad, or that it would be advisable to eliminate competition altogether from production and distribution. What socialists desire to eliminate is competition for pecuniary motive or the purpose of making money, but not competition for creating things better; excessive competition which causes disease, pauperism, misery and crime, but not competition which gives joy to life, like that in games. No one can deny that under private capitalism competition is contaminated with pecuniary motive as shown in adulteration, deception, and "cheap and nasty" goods, as well as in low wages and bad working conditions. Is one not blind that cannot see so many persons made unemployable through overwork under excessive competition resulting from the fear of unemployment, of want, of starvation?

One may ask, "Can there be had a wholesome competition under socialism?" The answer is, "Yes, certainly." It is not inconceivable that factories, for instance, will still compete with one another in producing better goods for at-

tracting public honor, but they will not compete so hard as under the pecuniary urge, regardless of the health and comfort of their workers. Again, it is conceivable that a worker will not overwork himself when there need no longer be the fear of unemployment, of want, of misery, of starvation, and that better work can be got from a man by the prospect of increased comfort than by the fear of unemployment and its miserable consequences.

The real problem is not whether we should or can eliminate competition altogether from the field of production, but whether we should or can eliminate it to the extent necessary to put an end to the curses of humanity to-day such as unemployment, disease, and starvation. Socialists make no war upon competition which does create progress; what they object to is competition which causes the unhappiness of humanity.

Anyhow competition is not the only and the best means to progress. Look at, for example, the wonderful progress of the health system of the United States. Is it due to pecuniary competition or to education and the research work which is conducted with every effort to keep all types of work up to as high a standard as possible. Look again at the fruit industry of California. Much progress has been made in raising good fruits. Is it due to competition or to the better methods introduced through the State Department of Agriculture? Business competition does some-

times bring about certain progress, but it is always wasteful and the progress achieved through competition can always be secured through education and research work. A Professor of philosophy - supposed to be very thoughtful - once said, "Under socialism little progress will be made because of the lack of competition. Unless one is an angel he cannot without competition always be looking forward to things better. Socialism will not work for the good of humanity until everybody is a saint or an angel." In other words, the point this Professor did want to bring out is that Socialism depends upon the right sort of men and competition is the necessary means to progress. The first part of the point is true but not comprehensive: men depend upon the right sort of system too. The second part is both untrue and uncomprehensive: competition is not only not the only means but also not a necessary one to progress, in view of the process of education and research work.

Whether progress is possible or not under the socialist government will be given light as I go on with other objections made to socialism.

(2). There is a prevalent opinion that unless one is given more money than another one would not work harder and longer. The answer to this is that at the national task it is neither fair nor desirable that he should work harder and longer. One can always use off one's super-

fluous energy on one's hobbies; and if there are those who are never happy unless they are working, they must not pretend that the extra work they put in to please themselves is a painful sacrifice for which they should be paid. In our present machine industry extra exertion is not possible: the collective work goes on at the engine's speed, and stops when the engine stops. This is seen in many factories where the pace is set for the lazy and energetic alike by the engine.

The problem then is not whether we should have something which can serve as an incentive to individual persons to work harder, but whether we should have an incentive to the community as a whole - an incentive to choose a high standard of living rather than a lazy and degraded one, all standards being possible.

The income being equal, who is going to do the dirty work? We have the habit to think that dirty work has to be done by dirty and poorly paid people, for we often see it done by them. We would not think in that way if we come to think of the most dirty and dangerous work done by scientists and physicians who are highly educated, highly paid, and move in the best society. Is it not a dirty work to dissect dead bodies and analyze the secretions and excretions of live ones, which are done by physicians and anatomists? Is it not a dangerous work to handle the epidemic and contagious diseases as doctors often do? Is it then the dirtiness of a work which

can disgrace the doer or the work which carries a stigma of social inferiority? Can we remove this stigma? Surely, we can. We must always have in mind the idea that a great deal of work which is now dirty because it is done in a crude way by dirty people can be done in a clean way by clean people. Nobody objects to necessary work of any kind because of the work itself; what everybody objects to is being seen doing something that is usually done only by dirty and uneducated persons.

Who is going to do the unpleasant sorts of work? The saying that God never made a job but He made a man or woman to do it is true up to a certain point. But it remains true that it is much easier to find a boy who wants to be a gardener, and a girl who wants to be a film actress, than a boy who wants to be a sewerman, or a girl who wants to be a ragpicker. There are many occupations which have great difference in nature: some are easy and enjoyable while others are hard and unpleasant. Under the system of the equality of income, who is willing to do the hard and unpleasant? This question is a harder one than the one concerning dirty work.

Fortunately, Bernard Shaw gives an admirable answer. He says, "There is one thing that we all desire; and that is freedom. By this we mean freedom from any obligation to do anything except just what we like, without a thought of to-morrow's dinner or any other of the necessities that make slaves of us. We are free only as long as we can say

"My time is my own." In a factory town it is often impossible to get a handy and intelligent domestic servant, or indeed to get a servant at all. That is not because the servant need work harder or put up with worse treatment than the factory girl or the shop assistant, but because she has no time she can call her own. She is always waiting on the doorbell even when you dare not ring the drawingroom bell lest she should rush up and give notice. To induce her to stay, you have to give her evenings and afternoons out in a week. We now see how we can make compensatory arrangements as between people who do more or less agreeable and easy sorts of work. Give more leisure, earlier retirement into the superannuated class, more holidays, in the less agreeable employments, and they will be as much sought after as the more agreeable ones with less leisure.¹"

(3) One objection made to socialism is that equality of income is not fair to merit. It only appears to be so at first thought, but upon second thought one will come to realize that the very thing which can throw light upon one's merit is equality of income. At present promotion means better income or salary, but when every one has the same income promotion means better merit. In popular consideration the person with two thousands a year inevitably takes precedence of the person with a hundred. Be-

1. B. Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, pp. 77-79.

tween persons of equal income there can be no eminence except that of personal merit. Is it not often seen that when there is inequality of income all merits are overshadowed by the merit of having a large income, which is not a merit at all? Does history not give us a graphic description of how Napoleon, a man of remarkable gift, was despised by his fellow students merely because of his poverty? Will history repeat the same sort of story if there is equality of income?

(4). Professor Ely says, "The socialist underestimates the importance of individual responsibility. To-day a man is confronted by the stern necessity of making his own way, and this must have some good effect upon character. On the whole, the lazy and incompetent are sifted out." This criticism instead of reducing my faith in socialism really increases it. It is not true that to-day every body is confronted by the stern necessity of making his own way. Many persons are living an idle, reckless, and luxurious life. Is it fair to have one person living a stern life and another a loose life? Is it a fair thing that one spends \$3,000 or 4,000 for a beautiful automobile and another has not decent clothes?

It is true that the stern necessity of making one's own way must have some good effect upon character. But is character produced in this way a true character? Can it be called true character not to do this or that just because of the fear of some unhappy consequence which

might happen to one's self? Is the servile attitude of poor people true character? Is it not also true that the stern necessity of making one's own way has some bad effect upon one's character? Is it altogether false that under this stern necessity many persons have come to be crooked and cunning? Furthermore, has this necessity not often smothered the courage of many persons to do good and right things which others don't like? Is it truthless that progress is often checked by the fact that people dare not do what they are not commanded to do for fear of being fired?

"The lazy and incompetent are sifted out." The present system has sifted out the lazy, but has not done anything with them. I have seen boys and young men neither working nor going to school. They may work for two or three days and then take a rest for four or five days. Throughout the year they may work only three or four months and spend the rest of the year in doing nothing. I have seen bums, tramps, and beggars, who are such persons not because they are defectives or otherwise but just because they are lazy. Should the government do something with them? Is Shaw not right when he says, "Weary Willie may say that he hates work, and is quite willing to take less, and be poor and dirty and ragged or even naked for the sake of getting off with less work. But that, as we have seen, cannot be allowed: voluntary poverty is just as mischievous socially as

involuntary poverty: decent nations must insist on their citizens leading decent lives, doing their full share of the nation's work, and taking their full share of its income. When Weary Willie has done his bit he can be as lazy as he likes. He will have plenty of leisure to lie on his back and listen to the birds, or watch his more impetuous neighbors working furiously at their hobbies, which may be sport, exploration, literature, the arts, the sciences, or any of the activities which we pursue for their own sakes when our material needs are satisfied. But poverty and social irresponsibility will be forbidden luxuries. Poor Willie will have to submit, not to compulsory poverty as at present, but to the compulsory¹ well-being which he dreads still more."

What has the present system done with those persons who are sifted out as incompetents? Do the capitalists feed them after they have fired them? Has the government now a budget for taking care of these incompetents? Are all these incompetents dying persons and are not able to be trained for other works than they had done before? It is true that in a country like America the defectives, the aged, and poor families, are taken care of either by government institutions or by private charity agencies. But what about those who are thrown out of factories as inefficient workers? Are they taken care of too? Are

1. Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*, pp. 72-73.

there many of them sure to get jobs even as sewer men or streetsweepers immediately after they are thrown out?

(5). Professor Ely says, "The socialist underestimates the efficiency of the present system. Much may be wasted, but much is also produced. Our economic world is, on the whole, a bettering world. The socialist is too pessimistic with respect to the present. He sees all of the starvation, misery, luxury, and extravagance, but he passes by the millions of comfortable homes scattered throughout the land." It seems to me that this criticism is characterized by conservatism. It seems to say that the present system is good enough and we have to be satisfied with it. Never mind the much waste so long as much is produced. It does not matter that a few are hungry if many are satisfied; it is not a wise advice that one should leave the ninety-nine sheep and go in search of the one lost. It is all right to manufacture big and heavy automobiles, regardless of the fact that so much iron is used up that our necessary things which are made of iron have come to cost much more than before owing to the resultant scarcity of iron.

(6). Professor Ely says, "The socialist underestimates the importance of free enterprise in industry. If a man now believes that he can develop a certain industry that will satisfy important wants of the people in the future, he does not need to secure the consent of some government official to make the experiment. A characteristic of free enterprise is that it seeks profits at the risk of

loss. The socialist forgets the losses¹ and sees only the rewards that go to business success." The trouble with this criticism is that it not only passes by the many unnecessary and anti-social products of the present system, but also overlooks the fact that much of the present loss in business is due to competition which creates the risky situation. Professor Ely is not doing justice to the socialist when he says, "The socialist forgets the losses and sees only the rewards that go to business success." As a matter of fact it is not the rewards but the losses of business that have most to do with the socialist's objection to the present system. The reason why socialists attack competition severely lies in the very fact that it gives rise to tremendous losses in terms of bankruptcy, the waste of the by-products and the duplication of services. Doubtless these losses can be done away with as soon as competition is eliminated to a proper extent.

Furthermore, the socialist does not maintain that free enterprise should be entirely eliminated. Bernard Shaw says, "A socialist government should not only tolerate private enterprise, but actually finance it. The business of socialist rulers is not to suppress private enterprise as such, but to attain and maintain equality of income. The substitution of public for private enter-

1. R. T. Ely, *Outlines of Economics*, p. 609.

prise is only one of several means to that end; and if in any particular instance the end can best be served for the moment by private enterprise, a socialist Government will tolerate private enterprise or subsidize enterprise, or even initiate private enterprise. Indeed Socialism will be more elastic and tolerant than Capitalism, which would leave any district without a carrier if no private carrier could make it pay."

However, Shaw says, "When a private experiment in business has been financed by the State, and has been successful in establishing some new industry or method or invention as part of the routine of national production and service, it will then be nationalized, leaving private enterprise to return to its proper business of making fresh experiments and discovering new services, instead of, as at present, wallowing in the profits of industries which are no longer experimental. For example, it has for many years past been silly to leave railways in the hands of private companies instead of nationalizing them, especially as the most hidebound bureaucrat could not have been more obsoletely reactionary, uninventive, and obstructive than some of our most pretentious railway chairmen have been. Everything is known about railway locomotion that need be known for nationalization purposes. But the flying services are still experimenting, and may be treated as State-aided private enterprises until their practice

becomes as well established and uniform as railway practice." ¹ This will not be in harmony with equality of income, unless there is the nationalization of banking which will make it quite easy for private businesses to be carried on under Socialism to any extent that may be found convenient, and will in fact stimulate them vigorously. The reduction of the incomes derived from them to the common level could be effected by taxing them if they were excessive.

(7). The most common objection to socialism, I have heard, is the impairment to liberty. Socialism would, in most people's mind, compel men to rise at morn to the sound of a state gong, breakfast off state viands, labor by time according to a state clock, and to be regulated as to rest and recreation. In fact, socialism proposes none of these things. What socialism does propose is that everybody unless he is sick or in the holidays allotted to him in case of marriage, birth, or death, should work for a certain number of hours as others. This does not reduce the liberty one has as at the present. Today a worker has to work, for example, eight hours a day; it is very probable according to the socialist view that he has to work only 4 or 5 hours under socialism because of the fact that in it no body is allowed to be lazy and a parasite. Hence when a person says that socialism im-

1. Bernard Shaw, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, p. 389.

pairs liberty, he is either ignorant of socialism or selfish, fearing that the more liberty he is enjoying than others would be taken away from him and that he has to work as hard as every others.

"Under socialism," says Professor Ely, "there would be simply the public sphere of employment, and there is reason to fear that the inability to escape from the public sphere would compel the submission to onerous and tyrannical conditions imposed by the administrative heads of the business in which one might be engaged. Those in whose hands political and economic control centered would have tremendous power, however they might be selected or appointed. Even as a consumer one has to-day a large freedom of choice and action, which he enjoys by virtue of the competition of producers and dealers.Competition. However imperfectly, gives freedom to the individual as producer and consumer." I admit that there is good reason for fearing the tyranny of "those in whose hands political and economic control centered." But there is better reason for believing a greater freedom or liberty as a result of a truer democracy than we have to-day. Every one is more or less endowed with sympathy toward others. To-day we are all economic slaves, the greatest and the least of us, with exceptions so few that they are hardly worth mentioning. The workers are slaves to the capitalists and the capitalists are in turn

slaves to competition which compels them to treat their workers as they should not be treated. Here and there we see in some business in which there is not competition enough to compel the owner to do his worst in the way of sweating his workers - the comfortable life of laborers. Besides, the strongest incentive to a man to get the most work out of others is the pecuniary motive, which will disappear in socialism. In short, it is safe to say that when one has only the equal amount of income no matter what he does, he will not, unless he is crazy, be so senseless or so unscrupulous as to put forth his tyranny just for the sake of inhumanity.

In addition to the subjective help of human nature, education may be resorted to for keeping us in paths leading to better and better realms of life. Tyranny will go out of existence when every body is inculcated with the right sort of ideas or ideals.

We must distinguish between the necessary and the unnecessary freedoms. It is true that to-day one has freedom as producer and consumer. Is it necessary to have such a freedom? Does it not take time for a housewife to go to a farther place for buying something which she thinks is better than the same thing which she can get at a nearer place? Is this not also true with a housewife so far as time is concerned, when she has to hunt over advertisements and advertisements appearing

daily on newspapers in order to get something of which the price suits her income? Who is willing rather to have the freedom of choice than to have as much money as others to buy as good things as others have? Is it sensible to maintain competition just for the sake of the freedom of choice, regardless of the waste it brings about as I have mentioned before, and the unfairness it creates in the sense that one cannot, financially speaking, get the same thing which others can get? Is it not equally unreasonable to maintain the freedom of production, regardless of the evils to which it has given rise, such as luxury, extravagance, unfairness, and the effect upon the cost of things necessary to life because of the reduction of the material of which they are made? The thing which makes me impatient with many people is that they give importance to things unimportant and unimportance to things important.

There is in many minds the dread of too much law under socialism or, in other words, that every act of our lives would be regulated by the police. This dread is ridiculous. All laws and restrictions have come to existence because of evils. Socialism will by getting rid of poverty get rid largely of evils such as corruption, thieving, rioting, swindling, disease, drunkenness, and prostitution; thus getting rid of those laws relative to these evils.

Speaking generally, it is a mistake to suppose that the absence of law means the absence of tyranny. Shaw's description of the tyranny of fashion, of the pain of destitution, and of private estate rules may be used as a good illustration. He says, "The only law concerned in this is the law that we must all wear something in the presence of other people. It does not prescribe what a woman shall wear: it only says that in public she shall be a draped figure and not a nude one. But does this mean that a woman can wear what she likes? Legally she can; but socially her slavery is more complete than any sumptuary law could make it. If she is a waitress or a parlormaid there is no question about it: she must wear a uniform or lose her employment and starve. If she is duchess she must dress in the fashion or be ridiculous. In the case of the duchess nothing worse than ridicule is the penalty of unfashionable dressing. But any woman who has to earn her living outside her own house finds that if she is to keep her employment she must also keep up appearances, which means that she must dress in the fashion, even when it is not at all becoming to her, and her wardrobe contains serviceable dresses a couple of years out of date. And the better her class of employment the tighter her bonds. The husband in the public employment, the socialized husband, is much freer than the unsocialized

one in private employment. He may travel third class, wearing a lounge suit and soft hat, living in the suburbs, and spending his Sundays as he pleases, whilst the others must travel first class, wear a frock coat and tall hat, live at a fashionable address, and go to church regularly. The lengths to which women are sometimes forced to go to please their private employers are much more revolting than, for instance, the petty dishonesties in which clerks are forced to become accomplices. Then there are estate rules: that is to say, edicts drawn up by private estate owners and imposed on their tenants without any legal sanction. We have to submit to these tyrannies because the people who can refuse us employment or the use of land have powers of life and death over us, and can therefore make us do what they like, law or no law. Socialism would transfer this power of life and death from private hands to the hands of the constitutional authorities, and regulate it by public law. The result would be a great increase of independence, self-respect, freedom from interference with our tastes and ways of living, and, generally, all the liberty we really care about."

To conclude let me sum up my thoughts. Socialism will not impair liberty. On the contrary, it will give to humanity economic liberty without which so-called individual

1. B. Shaw, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism, pp. 403-405.

and political liberty are fruitless. It proposes to regulate production, consecrate property, and concentrate wealth only to the extent necessary to assure to every man the maximum of security and the maximum of leisure; thereby putting an end to pauperism, prostitution, and in great part, to crime, and furnishing to man environment most conducive to his advancement and happiness.

What Religion Is

The reason why I put Socialism side by side with religion is the possibility of cooperation which I see between Socialism and Religion for working out a better social order than we have at present. My aim is to transform the hostility which has existed between the socialists and the religious believers into such a friendship as will make them co-workers for furthering the realization of a happy and wholesome world. I believe that a better understanding of socialism on the part of religious believers and a better understanding of religion on the part of socialists will naturally do away with the conflict they have maintained. Full of truth is Professor Werner Sombart's statement, "Fundamentally hostile views about religion are to be heard only in the circles of half-educated socialists." ¹ It is likewise full of truth to say that fundamentally hostile views about socialism are to be heard only in the circles of half-educated religious believers. This fact, that is, the hostility only between the half-educated ones of both sides, can be well illustrated by the observation of John Spargo as follows:

In every country Socialism numbers among its adherents many men and women of religious faith and affiliations. In the German Reichstag among the Social Democratic representatives loyal Roman Catholics have sat for years.

1. Sombart, Sozialismus and Sozial Bewegung (1908), p. 101

The first Roman Catholic to enter the Norwegian Storting was elected as a Socialist, while another Socialist representative elected at the same time was a Lutheran clergyman. In the Socialist Party of America there are thousands of men and women who loyally maintain religious affiliations. At a national convention of the party it is not at all uncommon to find, among the delegates, loyal Roman Catholics, clergymen belonging to various Protestant sects, active Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans - and so on through the list of Protestant sects.

We must understand that the atheistic stigma of Socialism is altogether adventitious. Most assuredly there is nothing in the economic programme of socialism which is explicitly or implicitly opposed to religion. Nor is there anything in the Marxian theories which the modern Socialist movement has accepted which is explicitly or implicitly in conflict with religion. In order to account for the widespread atheism and irreligion historically associated with the Socialist movement, a few events may be stated as follows:

(1) The Darwinian theories gave rise to a far-reaching rationalist movement and a tremendous amount of skepticism. The keenest and most thoughtful minds of the age stood by science while the conservative and narrow minds took side with religion. Religion came to be identified with the

foe of progress, of enlightenment and science. It was in the midst of such an atmosphere that the modern socialist movement arose. There is a good reason why socialists at that time embraced the new scientific theories. The radical in one sphere of thought is most likely to be radical in other directions. The fact that they were radicals, possessing sufficient independence of judgment, imagination and courage to renounce old ideas and to undertake the arduous and often unpleasant task of advocating new ideas, would have made the socialists more ready than most men to embrace the new scientific theories. Evolution was everywhere discussed. Liebknecht, who was intimately connected with Marx in those days, has told us how Marx and his little circle of friends could talk of nothing else. Naturally, they partook of the anti-religious spirit and temper which characterized the scientific movement of their day. It would have been strange of it had been otherwise. It was quite natural that the socialist movement should have battled for the new scientific theories against the orthodox religion of the time. What the socialist movement to-day has against religion is but that which is retained from the mental attitude acquired sixty-five years ago.

(2) Another stream of thought in the nineteenth century which had caused, to a very large extent, the blending of Socialism and atheism, was the democratic trend. This was by no means unique. Many movements of great

magnitude and capital importance have been thus adventitiously blended with skepticism and irreligion. The American Revolution affords a notable example of this. Many of the leading Revolutionary patriots were skeptics and atheists. This was not due to their democracy, but rather to the spirit and temper of the age. Present China is another example. Many of the reforming patriots are atheists and the National Department of Education is demanding the abolition of religious teaching in any school either private or public. This is just as little due to their political ideals and theories as the unbelief of the socialists is due to their social ideals and theories.

(3). It is with the Roman Catholic clergy, rather than with their religious beliefs, that socialism finds itself in conflict. This can be proved by the following quotation:

"Although Social Democracy respects every religious conviction and declares that such convictions are a matter of private concern for each individual; and although the doctrines of New Testament Christianity may be harmonized with our aims, it is none the less true that socialism in its struggle constantly meets the opposition of that authority which rules the Catholic religion, considered as a religion of the masses - the clergy."¹

The tolerant attitude of the socialist movement to-

1. Die Sozialdemokratic und die Katholische Kirche.

ward religion can further be proved by the following statement of Dr. Anton Pannekoek, an influential Marxist:

"We Socialists consider religion as a private concern of each individual, and we demand that the State shall take the same position. This demand proves clearly that the assertion of the clergy that we wish to abolish religion is simply a deception and a slander. The platform plank, 'Religion is a private matter,' clearly expresses that fundamental character of our movement by which it may be distinguished from all earlier revolutionary mass movements. We do not inquire into personal views; we do not demand any profession of faith; we insist only on cooperation in our practical aims. Our aim is a definite, material transformation of society, a different regulation of labor, the substitution of the Socialist mode of production for the present system. Nothing else. Anybody who wants to cooperate with us for the attainment of this aim is welcome as a comrade-in-arms, regardless of his philosophic,¹ religious, or other personal views."

When the disestablishment of the Church and the exclusion of the religious orders are carefully studied, we easily notice that the anti-religious character of French Socialism was due to a bitter feeling against that which the Church represented. The Socialists were by no means alone in their fight against Clericalism. Indeed,

1. The Catholic Telegraph, December 12, 1912. The Catholic Tribune of the same date.

they were not even the pioneers of that fight. The political activities of the church led to such widespread corruption and intrigues so serious as to menace, in the opinion of an overwhelming majority of the French people, the existence of the Republic.

(4). There is hatred for organized Christianity because it is believed to be false to the essential teachings of Jesus. The churches have depended upon the rich and powerful for maintenance, and in return have generally defended the existing social order and resisted the efforts of the workers to revolutionize it. They have been loyal to the class by which they are maintained rather than to religion. Their close association with the dominant economic class inevitably breeds in the minds of the struggling proletariat suspicion of and contempt for organized religion.

It is my hope that the adventitious association of atheism and socialism will soon be transformed into an association of religion and socialism by the mutual understanding of socialists and religious believers. Every socialist should understand that "Religion is inseparable from conduct, from human relations, and hence it is a social force of the greatest importance," and that "the economic and material factors of life" should not be allowed to exclude "the spiritual elements of humanity as unimportant as the coloring of a flower or the bloom on

1. The Socialist Party and Religion, an address to Citizens of Religious Belief and Affiliation, Vermont Socialist News, Vol. II, Double Number 8-9.

the grape."¹ Every religious believer should be "conscious of the fact that only when all are economically free, will true and lasting accord, true comradeship, true brotherhood, perfect spiritual freedom and true religion be possible";² and should realize, as did Walter Rauschenbusch, in the ideas of socialism "the most thorough and consistent economic elaboration of the Christian social ideal" and that "Socialism is far and away the most powerful force for justice, democracy, and organized fraternity in the modern world".³

Above all, a definition of religion is needed to bring the socialists and the religious believers to a position where they can work together harmoniously and cooperatively in creating a happier and more wholesome world for humanity. Numerous definitions of religion have been formulated. The idea, at least in my judgment, which can divide them into two distinct groups, is religion with God and religion without God. To me the idea of religion always implies God: systems of thought which do not include the idea of God are not religion in its true sense. At their best, when uncorrupted, Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism are better described as ethical systems, or as philosophies, than as religions. In the case of the former, moreover, while Buddha himself taught no definite theories of God

-
1. Christianizing the Social Order, by Walter Rauschenbusch, p. 398.
 2. Some Objections to Socialism considered and answered, by "Tattler," London, 1907, p. 16.
 3. Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 397.

or immortality, his followers undoubtedly deified him after his death, making a god of Buddha himself. In like manner, Taoism to-day is very different from the ethical system of Lao-tze. It has been impregnated with superstition, as witness its magic and incantations, so foreign to the teaching of Lao-Tze. Like Buddha, moreover, Laotze has been regarded and worshipped as a god. Altogether, then, it would seem that religion without a God to worship is an anachronism.

The reason why nowadays many intelligent minds identify religion with any sort of belief or conviction lies in the fact that they are engrossed in things which are merely associated with religion to the exclusion of the intrinsic thing of religion. The fundamental or original idea of religion is the sense of certain force or power or principle imminent in matter or certain object. religion in its original stage is like fetishism, animism, or totemism. All the other ideas of religion beside this are of later association from time to time. This is what we mean by saying that religion grows. To me it is justified to develop religion by broadening its bearing or meaning or application but unjustified to cut off its embryonic meaning.

Hence of all the definitions of religion it seems to me that the best is the one formulated by John Spargo as follows:

Religion is Man's belief in and worship of a supreme purposive Power (or powers) called God (or gods), and the regulation of his life according to what he believes to be the pleasure or desire, or the commands, of the God (or gods) worshipped.¹

This definition is in best accord with my idea of religion in that it embraces belief and conduct, which are the two vital elements of religion. Religion should be for man, but not man for religion. God should be believed not for the sake of God himself but for the sake of man. Unless religion can make a better man out of a person it is futile to have religion. Belief and conduct are the two vital elements of religion in that the former is like the root of a tree and the latter the stem with its branches, leaves, flowers, seeds, or fruits.

Is Spargo's definition incompatible with Christianity which is in my judgment the only one that can be identified with religion? That is the question I am to investigate. If the definition is compatible with Christianity, then is the body of religious principles possessed by Christianity incompatible with the body of social and economic theories developed by well-educated socialists? That is another question which I am to deal with.

The first question does not take much space to answer and I consider it unnecessary to put it as another

1. John Spargo, Marxian Socialism and Religion, p. 33.

chapter. When we want to determine the reality of a thing a good way to do it is to examine the source of the thing. For Example, if we want to know what Buddhism really is, we have to study the person who founded it. Original Buddhism is very different from later Buddhism developed in China, Korea and Japan. Original Buddhism stands without, as I mentioned above, any definite theory of God; whereas later Buddhism has not only a god of Buddha but also other gods. In the same manner, the reality of Christianity can only be discovered through the study of its founder, Jesus the Nazarene. We must ask ourselves such questions as the following:

- a. Did Jesus believe in God, ruler of the Universe?
- b. Did Jesus believe in the Fatherhood of God?
- c. Did Jesus believe in the Brotherhood of Man on the basis of the Fatherhood of God?
- d. Does the life of Jesus show that he regulated his living according to the ascertainable will and pleasure of God, the Father?
- e. Does the life of Jesus show that he did set the example of regarding others as brothers?
- f. Does the life of Jesus show that he took the sorrows, sufferings, and misfortunes of others, as those of his own?
- g. Does the life of Jesus show that he regarded the actualized love or social service as the

highest good and the true obedience to God's will?

Answers for all these questions can easily be found? in the First Three Gospels. Instead of answering them one by one, however, I answer them as a whole by quoting verses 43, 44, and 45 of the 6th chapter, At. Matthew:

You have heard the saying, 'You must love your neighbour and hate your enemy.' But I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven:

He makes his sun rise on the evil and the good, and sends rain on the just and the unjust.

Do we not in these verses see that Jesus looks to God for the highest model of conduct, as no conduct can be higher in character than to love one's enemy? Only when we know this, we can claim to have known the reality of Christianity. Only when we can always feel, as did Jesus, that we "must be perfect as (our) heavenly Father is perfect,"¹ we can honestly say that we are true Christians, and truly religious. Having made clear the compatibility of Christianity with the idea of religion, I am ready to proceed with the second question, I mentioned above, namely, the compatibility of Christian ideals with those of the socialists.

1. St. Matthew, 6:48.

Chapter 3

Can Religion and Socialism Co-exist?

Whether religion and socialism can co-exist or not depends upon whether there are ideals common to both of them. When I say 'religion and socialism' I mean Christianity and socialism. I believe that if there are teachings of Christianity which are of essential compatibility with the ideals of socialism, even though there is the adventitious hostility between them, as I observed before, Christianity and Socialism will in the long run be comrade-in-arms. A great deal of the argument of those Socialists who repeat the old contention that socialism and Christianity are irreconcilably opposed rests upon the false assumption that Christianity is essentially based upon a denial of the facts which modern research has gathered, and upon dogmas which in reality have long since been abandoned by most Christians. To the question as to whether socialism and religion can be reconciled the most handy and best answer is that they are so reconciled by tens of thousands in every land who find in each the complement of the other.

Now, what are the essentials of Christian teaching which are in accord with those of socialism? Are they not ethical ideals? This is the most important aspect of the subject, after all: that which is vital in any religion is not its thought concerning God alone, but

its teaching concerning human relations; not its theology alone but its ethics, its sociology.

Can the ethical ideals of Christianity be summed up in the two words, Justice and Brotherhood? The ideal of brotherhood in Christianity is such a well-known fact that it needs no explanation, and so I will go direct to its ideal of Justice. Christianity, in my judgment, was nothing more than the continuation and fuller development of Judaism, the soul of which is to be found in the stern, inflexible demand for justice voiced by Amos and Joel, by Micah and Hosea, Isaiah and Ezekiel. Jesus belonged to the prophetic line to which Moses and Micah, Isaiah and Ezekiel, belonged. Nothing is more noticeable than that almost all his teaching of which we have any record was concerned with man in his social relations, that he was not at all concerned with creed and altogether concerned with deed. Is not Christ's teaching very similar to that of the older Hebrew prophets - a teaching in which there is denunciation of oppression and tyranny, protest against injustice, rebuke for the despoilers of widows and orphans, scorn for an unfaithful priesthood become a servitor of power and privilege? These things, together with a profound and sublime faith in the coming of universal brotherhood, made Christianity the vital force it was in the world.

Is there antagonism between these ideals of Christi-

anity and those of Socialism? Nothing is more true than the fact that socialism has made a strong appeal to the sense of brotherhood. In its movement Socialism embraces men and women of all the nations of the earth, of all colors and all creeds. Wherever men and women are toiling for the leisure of others, and wherever poverty and misery lurk, the socialist movement presents itself. Never before in all the centuries were so many millions of people of divers races and religions, born to such widely varied traditions and environments, united in one great movement. From almost every country socialism draws its recruits.

As a further indication of the ideal of Brotherhood in socialism equality of opportunity aimed at by the socialist may be cited. Socialism does not, as commonly conceived, aim at a leveling down process, at a uniformity of development through the repression of exceptional talent and enterprise. The only equality aimed at by the socialist is equality of opportunity, out of which will develop a diversity of genius and attainment undreamed of as yet. Socialism does not long for the power to kill the variant characteristics fashioned by Nature in the mothers' wombs out of the stored experience of the centuries. On the contrary, it seeks to make possible the complete unfolding of each life; to make it possible for each human bud to attain a full and

perfect blossoming. In a word, it seeks for each equal opportunities to grow and develop.

This aim, that is, equality of opportunity, is also indicative of the ideal of justice fostered by the socialist, who thinks of the homeless proletarian, less fortunate than the foxes and the birds, with no resting place for his weary head, of the genius whom the present system of capitalism has failed to provide with the conditions necessary for the development of his aptitude, of the poor mother who is just as ambitious as the rich mother but cannot afford to send her children to school, of the poor who cannot have decent meals and clothes while the rich have two or three automobiles. Can a socialist of such thought hate and denounce Jesus who stood for the poor, the unfortunate, the sick, the defective, the lepers, and the widows; who was too big in his humanity to judge the woman at the well; tender in his love for the little children; withering in his scorn and contempt for an unfaithful and corrupt priesthood; sublime in his denunciation of an empty creedal caricature of religion; heroic and majestic in his anger at Mammon's desecration of the temple? This Jesus, can the socialists not revere as a great comrade? Is this not good reason for the fact that many of the early French Socialists were devout followers of Christ? Spargo says, "They identified Socialism with religion.

Vandervelde has reproduced from Proudhon's paper, *Le Peuple*, an interesting description of a banquet held by some French Socialists in 1848, at which toasts were drunk 'To Christ, the Father of Socialism,' 'To the coming of God on earth' and 'To the living Christ.' The whole literature of that early French Socialism is vibrant with a strong religious passion. Professor Ely has said of the Socialist movement in France in 1850: 'At that time if any one had visited the assembly rooms of a Communist or Socialistic society in Paris, he would in all probability have found there a picture of Christ with these words written under it, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the first¹ representative of the people.''"

Here one may ask, "If Socialism fosters similar ideals as Christianity, is it not possible for Socialism to take the place of Christianity?" No, neither one can take the place of the other, but one complements the other. Socialism deals with things temporal, not with things spiritual. It cannot take the place of a belief in God and the consciousness of dependence upon him. It cannot take the place of a sure and certain hope of immortality. Religion is not a transient emotional thing, but a deep-seated conviction in the purposive Supreme Power. It may evolve into a form vastly different from that which it traditionally and historically possessed, but it can

1. John Spargo, *Marxian Socialism and Religion*, p. 132.

never perish. It is a source of ideals and humanity cannot live without devotion to ideals. Socialism if it is to succeed must enlist the moral and spiritual embraced in organized religion.

On the other hand, religion needs the help of Socialism. The ideal of human brotherhood and justice which is the ethical core of Christianity cannot be as well realized within the existing capitalistic system as within the socialistic system. The Kingdom of God for which Jesus prayed, as did the older prophets of Israel before him, involved social justice and equal opportunity. Are there social justice and equal opportunity under the present system? Should the Christians seek them? Is it not meaningless to pray for the coming of the Kingdom of God without the realization of social justice and equal opportunity? Can the existing social organism stand the test of genuine Christianity, Christianity with the spirit of its Founder? Is it not noticeable enough that religion is subject to the limitations and restrictions inseparable from an economic system which is uncondusive to its ethical ideals? Let it be remembered by every Christian that unless there is a wholesome economic circumstance, it is impossible for every body to be thoroughly faithful to the ethical teachings and implications of Christianity.

It is, therefore, hoped that socialists and Christians

will give up their hostility, shake hands, treat each other with reverent sympathy, and cooperate in the common effort to establish social justice and fraternity in the spirit of Jesus.

Bibliography

- Bernard Shaw, The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism.
- Edmund Kelly, Twentieth Century Socialism.
- Richard T. Ely, Outlines of Economics.
- Testimony of Mr. Archbold (pp. 570-71) in the report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. I, 1900.
- Sombart, Sozialismus and Sozial Bewegung (1908), p. 101.
- Die Sozialdemokratic und die Katholische Kirche.
- The Catholic Telegraph, December 12, 1912. The Catholic Tribune of the same date.
- The Socialist Party and Religion, an address to Citizens of Religious Belief and Affiliation, Vermont Socialist News, Vol. II, Double Number 8-9.
- Christianizing the Social Order, by Walter Rauschenbusch.
- Some Objections to Socialism Considered and Answered, by "Tattler," London, 1907.
- John Spargo, Marxian Socialism and Religion.
- M. Hillquit, From Marx to Lenin, N.Y., Hanford Press, 1921.
- Webb, S. & B., The Decay of Capitalistic Civilization, N.Y., 1923.
- Kirkup, W., History of Socialism, 5th ed. by E. R. Pease, London, 1912.
- Laidler, Harry W., Socialism in Thought and Action, N.Y. 1927.
- Boucke, O.F.; The Limits of Socialism, N.Y., 1921.
- Gladden Washington, Christianity and Socialism, 1905.
- Guyot, Yves; Socialistic Fallacies, 1910.
- Mallock, W. H.; Critical Examination of Socialism.
- Richter, Eugen; Pictures of the Socialistic Future.
- Sombart, Werner; Socialism and the Social Movement, 1909.
- Simhkovitch, V.G.; Marxism vs. Socialism. 1913.

End of

Socialism & religion

This title was preceded by

A special study of the relationship of religious
education to the problem child
Ancient Israelitish beliefs concerning the future life

And is continued by

The renaissance of Jesus in India
Woman in the early church
Thomas Cranmer and his place in the Reformation

Search by above titles on archive.org to
continue reading this collection of Pacific
School of Religion Theses from 1931,
call number Thesis Cage 1931 v.4